



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/715,243	11/18/2003	Mark N. Heflin	991316	4994

7590                  10/13/2006

United States Army Legal Services Agency  
Suite 527  
901 North Stuart Street  
Arlington, VA 22203-1837

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

DINH, TIEN QUANG

[REDACTED] ART UNIT

[REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

3644

DATE MAILED: 10/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Art Unit: 3644



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**MAILED**

OCT 13 2006

**GROUP 3600**

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/715,243

Filing Date: November 18, 2003

Appellant(s): HEFLIN ET AL.

---

Alan P. Klein  
For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This Examiner's answer is to correct part 8 of the previous Examiner's Answer as ordered by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences.

**(1) Real Party in Interest**

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) Related Appeals and Interferences**

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

**(3) Status of Claims**

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4) Status of Amendments After Final**

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

**(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection is correct.

**(7) Claims Appendix**

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

**(8) Evidence Relied Upon**

5816535	Underwood	10-1998
4513931	Kenzie	8-1985
6578885	Tillman	6-2003

**(9) Grounds of Rejection**

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 1, 6-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Underwood et al in view of Kenzie and Tillman.

**(10) Response to Argument**

In response to applicant's arguments that Underwood in view of Kenzie and Tillman does not anticipated what has been claimed, the examiner would like to point out Underwood teaches knife 64 that is actuated by control element 62 to cut the extraction line of the parachute in case of an emergency is well known. The lines are cut by the use of an electronic device.

Underwood lacks the use of an alternative actuator that has a spring to bias the cutter toward the extraction line and the means for restricting the cutter from engaging and severing the extraction line. Kenzie teaches spring means 60 that biases the cutter toward the extraction line. The

Art Unit: 3644

means for mechanically restricting the cutter from engaging the extraction line can be shear pin 50, balls 80, or timing mechanism with firing pin 126 shown in figures 2 and 5. Hence, Kenzie teaches what has been claimed. Tillman is used to show that radio signals are well known. Taken all of this together, it is reasonable to say that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have used a remotely controlled cutter system that is spring biased to cut the extraction line and means to restrict the cutter from cutting the extraction line in place of Underwood et al's system as taught by Kenzie and Tillman as a substitution of parts. The references disclosed what has been claimed.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

T. Dinh



Conferees:

PP



JWE

